



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,805	03/07/2001	Claudio Guerra-Vela	UPR-0200	5466

24496 7590 04/07/2003

PATENT LAW OFFICES OF HEATH W. HOGLUND  
256 ELEANOR ROOSEVELT STREET  
SAN JUAN, PR 00918

EXAMINER

RAEVIS, ROBERT R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2856

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.	09/800,805	Applicant(s)	GUERRA-VELA ET AL.
Examiner	Robert R. Raevis	Art Unit	2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claim 1; how do the three (3) provided equations permit for a calculation of "vibrational modes"? After all, (1) the terms "n(sub)n" and "x(sub)n" and "p" (in the lowermost equation on the bottom of p. 21) are undefined, and (2) the squiggly "E" (in the second equation from the bottom of p. 21) is undefined.

O/R

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1; "the scanning force microscope" lacks antecedent basis.

3. Claims 7, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fourier.

Fournier teaches a method of determining the resonant frequencies of a van 2, including: fixing the van to a base 1; exciting the van proximate the base from selected blade oscillation modes (col. 2, lines 61-63; col. 3, lines 35-44); measuring displacement in the distal end with transducer 5 (col. 2, line 44); and detecting frequency (col. 3, lines 15-16) by comparing the measured displacement with the output of transducer 4 which is "taken as a reference for the excitation signal" (col. 2, lines 49-50).

Art Unit: 2856

As to claim 7; the output of the discriminator 6 appears to serve to provide a comparison ("comparing" of line 2 from last of Applicant's claim 1). Also, Fournier's reference to "various" (col. 2, line 62) oscillation modes suggests detecting a "plurality" (line 2 from last of Applicant's claim 1) of resonance frequencies.

As to claim 11; the mechanical properties of turbines and vans have been extensively studied.

4. Claims 8-10, 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fournier in view of Roeder et al.

As to claims 8, 9; Roeder teaches positioning both transmitters and receivers on the item under test to induce vibration for measuring resonance frequencies, suggestive of application of a contacting transmitter in Fournier. Known transmitter include those of the piezo type.

As to claims 13, 15, 16; attachment calls for any known mechanism, suggestive of adhesive.

As to claims 10, 14, 17 and 18; note Roeder's recorder 13 which suggests plotting frequencies.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Duncan and Niechonski test a cantilever body.

6. Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2856

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4900.

Robert

RAEVIS

Av2856